

CS Docket No. 01-129

RECEIVED

AUG 16 2001

I am writing in response to the FCC's call for comments on Video Competition.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Over the last few years the FCC itself has been the greatest barrier to competition. Can you imagine a regulation prohibiting anyone who owns a Chevy from replacing it with a Ford until they had gone without a car for three months? Or how about the analog of the current policy, requiring people to replace a car within thirty days, or NEVER be allowed to own one again? And you claim that such policies ENCOURAGE competition!!! How can anyone ever trust you??? Why does the FCC work so hard to prevent market forces from working?

C-Band satellite has long been the most complete competition to cable, yet the FCC appears to be a co-conspirator in an effort to eliminate this technology. The anti-competitive actions taken in an effort to kill C-band make MicroSoft look like Netscape's best friend. The courts would have had a hay day if MicroSoft had offered vendors ten dollars for every customer who switched from Netscape to MicroSoft, but you ignore small dish (better referred to as cable in the sky) companies who offer dealers a \$1,000 bounty for each C-band customer who switches to small dish. You also ignore blatantly false advertising!

"Local into local" network broadcasting is a pure fraud! It can never be practical in real rural America, though it can work in the top one hundred metropolitan markets. The whole issue of distant network signals is a fraud! Cable companies are free to, and routinely do provide distant network signals! This is pure discrimination against rural citizens. Over the last ten years rural America has fallen much more technologically behind as a direct result of the anti C-band actions we have seen. With broad band internet services likely to never reach many rural areas C-band again offers the best way to approach the advantages available in metro areas. It appears that the FCC is doing its best to make rural Americans second-class citizens!

I do have a couple positive suggestions.

FCC regulations should be designed to help C-band survive as it is the best opportunity to bring technology to rural America.

The market place should be set free on the distant network signal issue.

No. of Copies rec'd 071
List ABCDE

Programming fees should be based on the cost of programming, the cost of delivery and a market based profit. Content providers should be required to charge the same per viewer fees for programming delivered by satellite as by cable, rather than charging C-band customers ten to one hundred times more for the same product.

All programming delivered by satellite should be made available to C-band customers (for an appropriate fee). Rupert Murdoch should not be able to offer his channels to some customers and not others!

Sports networks and other program providers should not be allowed to restrict the geographic distribution of their products unless they can show valid evidence that such distribution would be harmful to their interests. As an example, I have been blacked out from network broadcasts of sporting events between teams in Colorado and LA, but I live in Kentucky. What did they gain by offending me?

Sincerely,

Gregory C. Jones, MD
4305 Van Thompson Rd.
Owingsville, KY 40360
giltmead7@mis.net